9th October 1928]

Alleged receipt of gifts by one P. Cunnayya, Foreman, in the Government Press.

* 448 Q.—Mr. C. VENKATARANGAM NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that one P. Cunnayya, Foreman of the Telugu Section of the Government Press, and a prominent member of the Government Press Party who is performing Harikathas, received gifts of valuable clothes and cash on the occasion of 'Seethakalyanam' Harikatha Kalakshepam by the Government Press Party in the month of July 1928;

(*b*) whether receiving such gifts is not contrary to Government Servants Conduct Rules; and

(*c*) whether the said Cunnayya obtained the permission of the head of the department to receive the same; if not, what disciplinary action has been taken against him?

A.—(*a*) The action suggested in the question would be a personal and private matter with which Government are not concerned.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) The question does not arise.

Mr. C. N. MUTHURANGA MUDALIYAR:—"May I know what action the Government proposes to take on the resolution passed in this House in September last?" 11-30 a.m.

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"I think the position of the Government, as far as I remember, has been made clear in my speech."

Reversion of imposers to the frame in the Government Press.

* 449 Q.—Mr. C. VENKATARANGAM NAYUDU: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether some of the imposers of the several composing sections of the Government Press, Mint Buildings, who are not members of the Government Press Party, were reverted to the frame during the acting period of Mr. J. Mahimadas as Assistant Superintendent while Mr. Pinto was on leave; if so, how many were thus reverted, and why and how long they were working as imposers;

(*b*) whether to meet the demand, the imposers of the High Court section are being brought into the composing current sections the imposers of which were reverted to the frame; if so, why;

(*c*) whether in January 1928 one Ponnuswami, imposer, Mount Road Branch Press, was reverted to the frame by the Assistant Superintendent owing to the slackness of work; and

(*d*) whether the order of reversion was not given effect to because the said Ponnuswami is a member of the Party and whether he continues as imposer, and if so, why?

A.—(*a*) Eleven imposers who had worked as imposers for three months to five years and three months, were reverted to frame (compositor's work). Government do not know whether they belonged to the Government Press Party.

[9th October 1928

(*b*) The imposers of the High Court form part of the current sections of the Government Press.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) The question does not arise.

Labour

Extension of the activities of the Labour Department.

*450 *Q.*—Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state with reference to his speech on 2nd March 1928—

(*a*) whether the details of the scheme proposed by the Labour Commissioner (Mr. Slater) are now available for the information of this House;

(*b*) whether the scheme has been approved by the Government;

(*c*) whether the proposed scheme gives scope for the extension of the activities of the Labour Department to new districts; and

(*d*) if not, whether the Government will consider the proposals made by the existing depressed classes associations in the mufassal to extend the Labour Department's activities to new districts?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The scheme is under the consideration of Government and is not yet ripe for being placed before the Legislative Council.

(*c*) Yes.

(*d*) Does not arise.

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"May I know how long it will take Government to place the scheme before this House?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"It will be placed before the House in connexion with the next Budget."

Mr. V. I. MUNISWAMI PILLAI:—"Is the hon. the Home Member aware that a large amount was surrendered last year, for want of re-organization of the Labour department?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD USMAN SAHIB Bahadur:—"On account of that we are having the scheme."

Land Revenue

Jamabandi allowance to village menials of Gudiyattam taluk for fasli 1336.

*451 Q.—Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that jamabandi allowance for fasli 1336 to the village menials of Gudiyattam taluk has not been disbursed to them as yet; and if so, why; and

(*b*) whether it is a fact that most of the menials come from the depressed classes and are very poor?

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) The Government are not aware whether the case is as suggested. The Board of Revenue has been asked to report.